



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ample before them of a free representative government—of a people governed by themselves,—it is no more possible that the nations will long bear any other, than that they should voluntarily dispense with the art of printing or the mariner's compass. It is therefore plainly no age for Turks to be stirring. It is as much as men can do, to put up with christian, with civilized, yea, with legitimate masters. The Grand Seignior is a half-century too late in the world. It requires all people's patience to be oppressed and ground to the dust, by the parental sway of most faithful, most catholic, most christian princes. Fatigued as they are with the Holy Alliance, it were preposterous to suppose they can long submit to a horde of Tartarian infidels. The idea that the most honorable, the most responsible, the most powerful office in the state, can, like a vile heirloom, follow the chance of descent, is quite enough to task the forbearance of this bold and busy time. What then shall become of viziers and sultans, when ministers are bewildered in their cabinets, and kings are shaken on their thrones? Instead of arming their misbelieving hosts against a people, who have taken hold of liberty, and who will be free, let them rejoice that great and little Bucharia are still vacant, and take up their march for the desert.

ART. XXI.—*Considérations sur l'Industrie et la Législation sous le Rapport de leur Influence sur la Richesse des Etats, et Examen critique des Principaux Ouvrages, qui ont paru sur l'Economie Politique, par Louis Say, de Nantes.* Paris, 1822. 8vo.

Mr LOUIS SAY, the author of this treatise, is the brother of Mr J. B. Say, whose book on political economy, is generally regarded as the most valuable elementary work on that subject. Mr Louis Say has already published a work entitled 'Principal causes of the wealth of nations and individuals,' which we have not had the good fortune to see, and which in the course of the treatise now before us, he defends against some objections on the part of his brother J. B. Say. Mr Louis Say, at the close of his introduction, modestly claims

indulgence for his work, 'as not being the production of a man of letters, but of a merchant resident in a sea port, which,' adds he, 'will not in the eyes of many persons be any objection to the work.' It is certainly none in ours. Nothing is more interesting to those, who pursue the study of political economy, than to compare the statement of intelligent merchants, manufacturers, and farmers, with the principles of the science. Nay, more, it is on an accurate and extensive acquaintance with the facts, which it is the business of the merchant, manufacturer, and farmer to observe, that we must depend for the solidity of the theories on the production, distribution, and consumption of national wealth. Besides the interest which naturally attaches to the writings of practical men, on the subjects with which they are respectively conversant in political economy, there have been several examples of individuals, particularly of the mercantile profession, who have acquired reputation as writers on the science in general. The larger number, however, of approved writers on political economy have not been men actually engaged in either of the great pursuits; and it may well be doubted whether either of them is remarkably favorable to the formation of a political economist. It is scarcely possible that the merchant, the manufacturer, and the farmer, should not be respectively not only acquainted almost exclusively with the details of his own pursuit, but more or less biassed in favor of the system, in which that pursuit plays the first part. There is nothing in political economy itself, which requires a practical man, in the common acceptance of the term. If there were, it is plain that the science could not exist, for no such individual could be found on earth. There are practical merchants, and practical farmers, and practical manufacturers; but we presume there are no persons in society who are all three at once, to any considerable degree. It must not, therefore, be demanded of the political economist, that he be practically concerned in all the great forms of acquiring, accumulating, and consuming wealth. The very fact that the political economist must be equally versed in all these pursuits, proves that he cannot, according to the common course of things, be *practically* engaged in either. To the justice of this remark in Europe, few we think will object, who are acquainted with the structure of European society. Here in America, the class of professed philosoph

ical writers cannot be said to exist, and the duty of directing the opinions of their fellow-citizens on all subjects necessarily devolves on some class of professional or practical men.

Besides this necessity of the case, our merchants are a class of men in general, most interested in manufacturing establishments ; and the most extensive agricultural improvements have, also, in the northern and eastern states, been made by those, who, in earlier life, were employed in commerce. The agriculture of the great planters at the south is indeed an independent pursuit, but, as is judiciously observed by Mr Webster, in his discourse at Plymouth, of the agriculture of the West Indies, it is in its leading features of the nature of commerce, dealing in the exchange of large masses of staple products. It is accordingly not uncommon to meet with intelligent individuals in this country, who are in reality acquainted, as practical men, with two, if not with three, of the great pursuits in question, to a degree beyond what is often observed in Europe, where the partition walls among the different vocations in society, are much more lofty and solid than with us. And yet, notwithstanding this favorable circumstance for the formation, in this country, of what might be called a class of practical, political economists, it is the lawyers upon whom the task generally devolves of writing and speaking on the subject ; and who, from Mr Hamilton down to Mr Baldwin, have done the most to give a direction to public opinion, on this subject. As political economy is purely a speculation, there is no wonder that it should have fallen into the hands of that profession, whose business it is to reduce all the affairs of life to principle, and to unfold, in the perplexed tissue of affairs, the abstract rule, by which they are to be settled. There is perhaps no study whose materials are to be drawn from out of doors life, of which the principles are more abstruse than political economy ; and when we add to this the very extensive range from which these materials are to be gathered, it will not be wondered at that they require to be collected and digested, not in the walks of business, but in the solitude of meditation.

We make not these remarks in disparagement of the efforts of Mr Louis Say, who evinces a powerful mind, and who has evidently employed the intervals of his leisure in a profound study of the science, on which he has written. The treatise before us is of a critical nature. It passes in review the sys-

tems of the most distinguished political economists, from that of Dr Quesnai down to that of the Vicomte de Saint Chamans, an author whom we shall presently introduce to the notice of our readers and the admiration of one portion of the political economists of the United States. Mr Louis Say successively treats of some of the principles and theories unfolded in the works of Quesnai, Dupont de Nemours, Adam Smith, (to whom one of the longest chapters is devoted,) of Mr Canard, the Earl of Lauderdale, of Mr Ganilh, of Mr Ricardo, (whose views are also investigated at length,) of Mr Malthus, of J. B. Say, of Destutt de Tracy and finally of the Vicomte de Saint Chamans. The work of our author being itself of a critical nature, and it being really necessary to put some limit to the range of reviewing, we shall not think of going into an examination of all its parts. We shall content ourselves with selecting as a specimen of Mr Say's criticism, his remarks on *the division of labor*, as explained by Adam Smith, and shall then borrow from him an account of the last named author, the Vicomte de Saint Chamans.

One of the greatest tributes to the merit of Adam Smith may be found in the numerous criticisms made upon him by his successors ; criticisms, which have resulted in pointing out some errors. In the first attempt to constitute political economy into a science, it is no disparagement to say that errors have crept into his work ; while the care and the acumen, which succeeding writers have bestowed on the *Wealth of Nations*, prove that the reputation of Adam Smith has not sustained itself, through the blindness and indifference of those who have followed him. No subject in this most sharp-sighted age, has been so keenly scrutinized as the wealth of nations, and no philosopher who wrote seventy years ago, has so well maintained his reputation as Adam Smith. The vehemence, not to say passion, with which he has been lately assailed in this country, leads us, before quoting Mr Say's observations, to remark that the work of Adam Smith was closely studied by those immortal statesmen, who framed the American Constitution. Mr Gallatin, in his profound discourse on the finances of the United States,* expresses the opinion, that in the provision relative to direct taxation, the very words of Adam Smith, in a sense, according to

* A Sketch of the Finances of the United States, by Albert Gallatin. New-York, 1796.

Mr Gallatin, peculiar to that philosopher, are made use of by the framers of the constitution. Whoever will compare the first portion of Mr Hamilton's report on Manufactures, with the chapters of the *Wealth of Nations*, where the same topics are treated, will perceive that Mr Hamilton has often done little else than repeat in his own language what had been not ill said already by Dr Smith ; to which indirect mode of quotation he seems to allude, when, towards the close of the preliminary part of that report, he introduces a quotation from 'the *Wealth of Nations*,' thus : 'the following remarks are sufficiently judicious and pertinent to deserve a literal quotation.*' Lastly, we may observe, that Mr Gallatin, in the tract to which we have already alluded, repeatedly quotes, and in a respectful manner, this immortal work, which it is the practice of one class of writers in the United States, at the present day, to treat with affected derision. We have made this short digression, in the hope that the names of Gallatin, of Hamilton, and of the framers of the Federal Constitution, will have some weight with that large class of our citizens, who may want leisure to read many books themselves, and whose prejudices are excited against the soundest deductions of political economy, by the assertion that Adam Smith and his followers are a school of dreamers. We now proceed to Mr Louis Say's remarks on the doctrine of the *division of labor*, as taught by Adam Smith. Those, who may think that he detects an error on this subject, in the '*Wealth of Nations*,' may spare their triumph over its author, when they reflect that this error at least is common to all schools of political economy, and by the phrase '*division of labor*,' is, as it were, incorporated into our language.

This phrase, according to our author, is confused and scarcely significant, and when the subject is analyzed, it will be found that what is ascribed by Adam Smith to the division of labor, is chiefly owing to the use of machinery. One man may in this way do the work, which twelve would have been necessary to perform without the requisite machines ; and twelve men, deprived of the machines and tools which the pin-makers, for instance, use, would be far from fabricating as many

* Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the subject of Manufactures, made Dec. 5, 1791. Reprinted by order of the House of Representatives, Dec. 7, 1809. See page 77.

in the same space of time as one man, with the proper instruments and the skill to use them.

‘This, pursues our author, is simple and evident; but Adam Smith seems to have rendered the subject complicated and obscure, in attributing the increase of wealth to what he calls the division of labor. In the first place, this expression is indistinct in itself, and Adam Smith before dwelling so long on ‘division of labor’ should have explained what he understood by this phrase. Nevertheless from the example which he cites of the pins, in which every one of the ten operations, necessary in making a pin, is performed by one man exclusively, it may be inferred that, by division of labor, he understands the separation of the different sorts of labor necessary to complete the production of a work, and the assignment to different workmen severally of those different operations. To a division of labor thus explained, Adam Smith attributes the increase of wealth, but it seems to us that his example shows that it is to the use of machines and instruments that it is to be ascribed, and not to the division of labor. In this example he begins with naming twelve operations necessary to the production of a single pin; divided as follows, among ten or twelve laborers, namely: 1. One who draws the wire. 2. One who straightens it. 3. One who cuts it. 4. One who points it. 5. One who grinds it at the top, to receive the head. 6, 7, 8. A first, second, and third workman, in making the head.* 9. One who puts on the head. 10. One who whitens the pins. 11. One who pricks the paper. 12. One who sticks the pins. He continues, “I have seen a small manufactory of this kind where ten men only were employed, and when some of them consequently performed two or three distinct operations. But though they were very poor, and therefore but indifferently accommodated with the necessary machinery, they could, when they exerted themselves, make among them about twelve pounds of pins in a day. There are in a pound upwards of four thousand pins of a middling size. Those ten persons, therefore, could make among them upwards of 48,000 pins in a day. Each person, therefore, making a tenth part of 48,000 pins, might be considered as making four thousand eight hundred pins, in a day. But if they had all wrought separately and independently, and without any of them having been educated to this peculiar business, they certainly could not each of them have made twenty,

* Mr Louis Say (or Garnier, the French translator of Adam Smith) makes the most of the latter here. His words in the original English are, ‘to make the head requires two or three distinct operations.’ *Wealth of Nations*, Book I. c. 1. In summing up the matter however, A. Smith observes, that ‘the important business of making a pin is divided into about *eighteen* distinct operations.’

perhaps not one pin in a day ; that is certainly not the two hundred and fortieth, perhaps not the four thousand eight hundredth part of what they are at present capable of performing, in consequence of a proper division and combination of their different operations.”

‘ In the first place we remark on this example, that it is asserted that the ten workmen made in a day twelve pound of pins ; which at the rate of twelve hours of effectual labor, amounts to a pound of pins to each hour of labor. Now as this pound contains 4000 pins, and as there are but 3600 seconds in the hour, it follows of consequence, that neither of the workmen can devote the whole of a second to the longest operation on one pin ; because in one hour, four thousand pins must have passed through his hands, in order that at the close of the day, no one of the 48,000 be deficient in respect to any one of the operations. This is, at first, rather hard to believe, but there is nothing to reply to the words *I have seen*, with which A. Smith introduces the example. We may suppose, however, that these ten workmen were not charged with pricking the paper or sticking the pins, for these two operations would probably have required two workmen, so that there would have remained but eight workmen for the manufacturing of the 48,000 pins ; which at the rate of ten operations to a pin, would make 48,000 operations a day for each workman, or scarce three quarters of a second to each operation, the twelve hours containing 43,000 seconds.

Confining then the manufacture to the ten first operations, by which a pin is produced, we may suppose very reasonably that a master pin-maker shall have learned and practised for himself each of these operations, and that he has been successively drawer of the wire, straightener, cutter, pointer, &c. ; and consequently that in a factory which yields twelve pounds of pins in a day, or one pound of 4,000 pins in an hour, such pin-maker might have performed four thousand times in an hour any given operation, or, what is the same thing, 4,800 times in an hour and twelve minutes. Suppose then that the pin-maker, after having labored an hour and twelve minutes on the first operation, passes to the second and labors upon that, also, for one hour and twelve minutes, at the end of two hours and twenty-four minutes, he will have performed 4,800 times the two first operations. In continuing in this way, when he has finished the tenth operation, he will have labored for ten times one hour and twelve minutes, that is, for twelve hours ; and he will have performed in this time four thousand eight hundred times every one of the ten operations, which compose the manufacture of a pin, that is to say, he will have manufactured 4,800 pins in the day, instead of twenty or even one, as maintained by Adam Smith. Allow that this pin-maker lose twelve minutes, at every change of operation by a little less

dexterity for want of exclusive employment on one, and that he employ an hour and twelve minutes upon the operation which would have cost but an hour, to one devoted solely to it, and he will have made in the day 4,000 pins only, instead of 4,800; that is, only one sixth less, instead of four thousand eight hundred times less, which, according to Adam Smith, would have been the result of a want of the division of labor.' p. 34—38.

Though we think our author here attributes too little to the dexterity acquired by exclusively performing one operation, yet we agree with him, in the main, that Adam Smith has most unreasonably exaggerated the beneficial effects of a division of labor; and we have no doubt that on analyzing the mechanical trades, where the greatest gains are ascribed to this division, it would be found that the chief saving was in the use of tools. Still, however, the mistake of Smith is rather in too great a detail of his example, and above all in using the phrase of 'division of labor,' than in his principles. When he comes to explain *how* the division of labor is advantageous, he very correctly ascribes its advantages, *first*, to the superior dexterity acquired by being confined to one operation; *secondly*, to a saving of time, which would be lost in passing from one operation to another; and *thirdly*, and lastly, (and we will add *mainly*,) to the use of proper machinery.* The true doctrine of the division of labor, we apprehend, will be found contained in this proposition, namely, that, other things being equal, 'those manufactures will be most productive, where the business is conducted on so *large a scale*, that appropriate machinery and separate workmen will be assigned to every operation.' This proposition implies a great market, and a great capital, and in short all those things, well known to favor the rapid accumulation of wealth, and leaves little or nothing to result from the metaphysical notion of division of labor. The whole error of Smith, like most of his other errors, is merely a little of that looseness of language, which must necessarily creep into the first essays on a moral science.

We proceed now to make our readers acquainted with a work entitled '*Du système d'import fondé sur les principes de l'économie politique*;'—'a system of taxation founded on the

* These three modes, in which the advantageous operation of the division of labor is explained, are mentioned in Hamilton's report on manufactures, nearly in the words of Adam Smith.

principles of political economy,' by the Vicomte de Saint Chamans, master of requests to the council of state, and prefect of the department of the Haute-Garonne. Mr Louis Say treats this work, with great external magnanimity, but it is plain that he regards it with mingled pity and horror, and he reasons against it with that melancholy earnestness, with which a sensible man always urges self-evident truths on those, who he knows will not comprehend them.

'The works hitherto noticed, says he, are all of the school of Adam Smith, and their errors arise from the faults of his nomenclature. The work we are now to examine belongs not to this school; it may be regarded as representing the vulgar opinions on political economy. It is for that reason that I proceed to refute not so much the errors contained in it, as those of people ill instructed in what concerns the interest of nations; and what is singular enough is that the greater part of governments are of this number.'

For ourselves we shall not take the thing so much to heart, but quote a few of M. de Saint Chamans' maxims, and leave them to the judgment of our readers.

His fundamental maxim is, 'all consumption is productive;' from which postulate he deduces three consequences:

'1. That saving, instead of enriching, impoverishes the state; he who spends all his income, enriches society; he who spends his capital ruins himself, but does not impoverish society,—on the contrary he enriches it.

'2. Luxury is the greatest source of wealth for countries, where there is industry enough to supply all kinds of demand.

'3. That the expenses of the government do not impoverish the country any more than private expenses, and that taxes, well laid, instead of impoverishing enrich a country.'

Having quoted these principles and the illustrations which M. de Saint Chamans subjoins, Mr Louis Say states the reasons, why the worthy viscount cannot, as would at first be suspected, be thought ironical. The only reason why he ought to be supposed sincere in his paradoxes has escaped Mr Say; it is, that the prefect of the Haute Garonne is ignorant of the subject of political economy.—Happy for the world if the Haute Garonne were singular in its prefect.

The second chapter of his work is entitled *on gold and silver coin and on the balance of trade*, a chapter which, if we

mistake not, will procure the viscount the honor of being translated in this country, and of passing through three or four editions in as many weeks. There is a wrathful naïveté in Mr Say's manner of introducing his notice of this chapter, which has a good deal pleased us.

‘The ideas of M. de Saint Chamans, on money, and on the balance of trade, are those which are the most generally adopted by persons who have reflected but little on the matter, and who regard first appearances as decisive; like children who because they see the sun every day traverse the heavens from east to west, believe they know the nature of this luminary, not being able to distinguish the appearance from the reality, and who, in proportion to their own ignorance, laugh at those who tell them the sun is at rest in the centre of the system.’

The following is M. de Saint Chamans' system of the balance of trade.

‘That a country is growing rich by drawing specie to itself from foreign countries; that it grows poor when specie passes from it to other countries; to take, in consequence, all modes of discovering which country sends the most merchandise to the other, and draws the most specie from it; to adopt every step either by prohibition of foreign merchandise, or by forbidding the exportation of gold and silver, to make one's country sell more than it buys, and by consequence, receive a tribute in money, which is called having the balance of trade in its favor, in a word, to have this balance in our own favor, and to prevent its being against us, *voilà*, says M. de Saint Chamans, the system long adopted by the governments of Europe.’

Thus far the doctrines of the author, with whom Mr Say has made us acquainted, are certainly not peculiar to him, though not often embodied in treatises of political economy. In the principles, which we now proceed to quote, though our readers may not espouse his opinions, they will probably do full justice to his consistency.

His third chapter is entitled, on *Prohibitions and Machines*, and thus he handles them.

‘A premium of a million of francs, says he, has been offered for the invention of a machine for spinning flax and hemp. What would become of the persons of the two sexes now employed in spinning by hand? It would be wiser to pay a million to bury the secret, if it should be discovered. It were to be wished that governments would cease to rush blindly towards such improvements, and weigh the danger which arises from machines.’

Fortunate for Sir Richard Arkwright, that he was not a native of the Haute Garonne ; fortunate for Mr Whitney, that he did not devise the saw-gin in the prefecture of M. de Saint Chamans, unless he should think that in the viscount's proposal to pay a million francs to keep the machine secret, he should have fared better than he has done by making the saw-gin known.

The tenth section of this classical treatise, is on the advantages of taxation, which the viscount esteems one of the great blessings of civilized society. The illustration which he offers in support of it, shows the *practical* economist.

‘ A robber takes from me a purse of a thousand francs, and buys with them a fine horse, which I proposed to buy. I perceive indeed, that I have sustained a change and a loss, but I see that society has suffered neither, and is quite indifferent whether I or the robber be the rider or the walker.’

This author adds with astounding frankness, ‘ *the government who taxes, is a legal robber,*’ a proposition which Mr Say professes his willingness to take on the credit of the viscount, ‘ who being an agent of the government is competent to speak to the point.’

But it is time to leave this noble author, whose work we believe is the only one bearing the name of a treatise on political economy, in which such doctrines as we have quoted from it are held forth. These doctrines, it is true, have a great and extensive agency in the world ; not as Mr Louis Say thinks, because the governments at the present day share the opinions of Mr Saint Chamans, but because they dare not adventure on great changes. M. de Saint Chamans declaims against machines ; did the invention of machinery depend on governments, the terrors of a Luddite mob, might often influence the weak nerves of a minister to prohibit the most brilliant improvements. Adam Smith observes, in the so often quoted and admirable illustration, that at about thirty times the expense of French wine, very good wine could be raised in Scotland. Suppose that the ministers of a former day had followed up their theory resolutely, had prohibited all foreign wines, had offered bounties for the juice of the domestic grape, and at length brought the thing so far that the Lothians were covered with green-houses and intersected with flues ; that many millions of pounds sterling were invested in the estab-

lishment, and that six hundred thousand laborers received from it their support. Would any minister dare to repeal the laws, by which this preposterous burden was laid on the nation? Let the history of Spitalfields—the miniature of this supposed monstrous case—furnish the answer. It requires only that an abuse should be established, that a strong local interest be pledged to its support, that capital be invested in sufficient quantity, and laborers depend in sufficient numbers on the continuance of the nuisance, and ministers will love their popularity too well to abate it. The interested few, are ever more zealous than the oppressed many. Various such partial interests combine to support each other. The dealer in Port wine, lends a vote to the silk mercer, against the importation of French silks, and has his reward in another vote against the importation of claret. There is no doubt but that in this way, by a system of compromises, well adapted and long pursued, industry, even when disjointed on the rack of legislative interference, may yet fix itself in a firm, though in an unnatural posture, as a man may get to walk about upon a limb which has been dislocated and has grown callous out of the socket. But his motions are stiff and inconvenient; and what is worse, the evil cannot be remedied, or only by cruel sufferings. Thus the great remedy of the gathering abuses in states, is too often derived only from the last solemn act of an over taxed, an over governed, an over wrought people: from the stern and elementary legislation, which passes not beneath pillared domes, nor on the luxurious sofas of a senate-house, among the benignant mockeries of black rods and white rods, and the tinkling of speakers' bells, and the putting down and taking up of maces; but in the stormy tribunals of the multitude, long suffering, late awakening, and slowly satiated. Prohibitions, bounties, monopolies, succeed upon each other by reasons of state, compromise of rival interests, delusion, or timidity of rulers, till the whole action of society is disordered, and when the evil is too great to be longer borne, the populace rising in its strength and in its wrath, as blind as it is infuriated, conscious only of its sufferings and ignorant of the remedies sweeps all off at one blow, and substitutes Jack Cade's tariff in its stead: 'Then shall seven halfpenny loaves be sold for a penny: the three hooped pot shall have ten hoops, and I will make it felony to drink small beer.' By the blessed device

of a representative government, our beloved country has hitherto been spared from a near approach to these evils. In the expressive language of Mr Gallatin, at the close of his report on Manufactures, April 17, 1810, 'no cause has more promoted, in every respect, the general prosperity of the United States, than the absence of those systems of internal restrictions and monopoly, which continue to disfigure the state of society in other countries.' The various, and, if we must call them so, the conflicting interests, find their respective advocates on the floor of congress, and there will ever be much reason to acquiesce in what is there done, as being done on a large view of the general welfare. In the great question, which has for some years past been there agitated, of additional encouragement to the manufacturing interest, those concerned in it certainly cannot complain that their cause has not been pressed with ability and zeal, and will find we think, on a calm review of what has been done for them, that those, who have opposed the full extent of their demands, have, nevertheless, in the language of our revered chief magistrate, to the sixteenth Congress, been willing to extend to manufactures, all the encouragement, which is consistent with a 'due regard to the other great interests of the nation.'